REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has canceled claims 13, 19 – 21, 38, 44 – 46, 59, 64 – 66, 80, 85 – 87, 93 – 114 and 133 – 140; amended claims 1, 9 – 12, 14 - 18, 22, 23, 26, 34 – 37, 39, 41 – 43, 47, 48, 51, 60 – 63, 67, 68, 70 – 72, 81 – 84, 88, 89, 92, 115, 118, 124 and 126; and added new claims 143 - 175 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 – 12, 14 - 18, 22 – 37, 39 - 43, 47 – 58, 60 - 63, 67 – 79, 81 – 84, 88 – 92, 115 – 132, 141 and 142 - 175 are presented for examination.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examined has objected to the specification as being inconsistent with the figures. Applicant has amended the specification accordingly.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 20, 45, 65, 71, 86, 92, 118 – 120, 124 and 126 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims accordingly. Applicant notes that the Examiner has also rejected claim 70, and has amended this claim accordingly as well. However, applicant does not understand the Examiner's grounds for rejecting claims 119 and 120.

On pages 4 – 9 of the Office Action, in Paragraphs I and II, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8, 12 – 15, 26 – 28, 30 – 33, 37 – 40, 51 – 53, 55 – 60, 71 – 74, 76 – 81, 92 – 95, 97, 101, 103 – 106, 108, 112, 114, 133, 135, 137 and 139 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Howard et al., US Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 ("Howard"). Applicant has canceled claims 93 – 95, 97, 101, 103 – 106, 108, 112, 114, 133, 135, 137 and 139 without acquiescence to the Examiner's reasons for rejection and respectfully submits that rejection of those claims is thus rendered moot.

On pages 9 – 11 of the Office Action, in Paragraphs III and IV, the Examiner has rejected claims 115 – 117, 121, 124 – 126, 130, 141 and 142 under 35

U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bloomberg, US Patent No. 5,761,686 ("Bloomberg").

On pages 11 – 12 of the Office Action, in Paragraphs V and VI, the Examiner has rejected claims 4, 29, 54, 75, 96 and 107 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard and further in view of the definition of XML. Applicant has canceled claims 96 and 107 without acquiescence to the Examiner's reasons for rejection and respectfully submits that rejection of those claims is thus rendered moot.

On pages 12 – 19 of the Office Action, in Paragraph VII, the Examiner has rejected claims 9 – 11, 19 – 25, 34 – 36, 44 – 50, 64 – 70, 85 – 91, 98 – 100, 102, 109 – 111, 113, 134, 136, 138 and 140 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard in view of Bloomberg. Applicant has canceled claims 19 – 21, 44 – 46, 64 – 66 , 85 – 87, 98 – 100, 102, 109 – 111, 113, 134, 136, 138 and 140 without acquiescence to the Examiner's reasons for rejection and respectfully submits that rejection of those claims is thus rendered moot.

Applicant notes that the Examiner's paragraph numbers advance from VII on page 12, to IX on page 19 of the Office Action. Applicant presumes that the Examiner's intent was that the paragraph numbering advance to VIII instead of IX on page 19.

On pages 19 – 21 of the Office Action, in Paragraph IX, the Examiner has rejected claims 16 – 18, 41 – 43, 61 – 63 and 82 – 84 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard.

On pages 21 – 24 of the Office Action, in Paragraph X, the Examiner has rejected claims 118 – 120, 122, 123, 127 – 129, 131 and 132 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomberg and further in view of Howard.

Distinctions between Claimed Invention and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 to Howard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,686 to Bloomberg

Howard describes a limited-use browser and security system that protects content downloaded from the Internet to a client computer from being copied

without authorization. The downloaded content is displayed in a view-only mode and, while the content is being displayed, menu selections, key combinations and pointing device commands initialized on the client computer that can copy content are disabled (Howard / paragraph [0020]).

Howard describes two security models for protecting transmitted content; namely, an individual security model that generates a secure document package, and a common security model that uses encryption (Howard / paragraph [0045]). The secure document package is a dynamically compiled executable, and is encrypted using individual user level encryption keys (Howard / paragraphs [0046], [0072], [0108], FIG. 3). The common security model transmits a stream of encrypted content to the client computer, and is encrypted using a system level encryption key (Howard / paragraphs [0046], [0082], [0086], [0108]). Howard describes encryption performed at step 445 of FIG. 4C, and corresponding decryption performed at step 527 of FIG. 5B.

Bloomberg describes a method for embedding information within an iconic version of a text image. The encoding method of Bloomberg is similar to that of a bar-code, in that it uses rectangular blocks of varying sizes, as indicated in FIG. 10, to represent data. The rectangular blocks are contained within an iconic image, such as the iconic image 20 of FIG. 2, used to represent an image of text, such as the text image 10 of FIG. 1. Bloomberg describes generating the iconic image so that it has the same characteristic layout appearance as the text image when rendered for display (Bloomberg / col. 4, lines 37 – 42; col. 5, lines 36 – 38; col. 11, line 66 – col. 12, line 5; col. 25, lines 7 - 13)

Thus, as described in Bloomberg with respect to FIG. 11 regarding a first encoding example, the fourteen rectangular blocks in region 76 have respective lengths of:

(first row) 40 pixels, 45 pixels, 15 pixels, 45 pixels,

(second row) 10 pixels, 10 pixels, 45 pixels, 30 pixels, 30 pixels,

(third row) 15 pixels, 40 pixels, 20 pixels, 10 pixels, 15 pixels,

representing the first forty-two bits of the message of FIG. 3; namely, 1001010011010110111011101100011001110110011. Similarly, as described in Bloomberg with respect to FIG. 14 regarding a second encoding example, the bit sequence 85 corresponds to the six rectangular blocks in row 86, by associating a 0 with background and a 1 with foreground. Using either encoding, the result is an image portion with rectangular blocks of varying size, position and spacing, where the variations are used to embed a message. Bloomberg also describes determining how many encoded rectangular blocks fit within a horizontal line, and positioning the blocks for left and right justification (Bloomberg / col. 12, line 63 – col. 13, line 21; col. 14, lines 16 - 23).

Regarding decoding of the encoded rectangular blocks, Bloomberg describes use of morphological operations to locate encoded block regions, and histogram analysis to quantize the block lengths (Bloomberg / col. 17, line 9 – col. 22, line 49; FIG. 17).

The present invention describes a method and system for encrypting data within web pages, and for controlling the formatting of the web page so that the page is formatted for the data as it would be decrypted, instead of for the encrypted data contained within the page. As such, (i) if the web page is saved or copied, the saved or copied data includes only encrypted text (FIG. 1A); yet (ii) if the web page is displayed by a web browser, the displayed page includes only decrypted text (FIG. 1B).

Thus the present invention displays a text image, such as a web page displayed within a web browser, from a source text file, such as an HTML file, where the text image includes text that is different from the text of its source file. Specifically, the source file includes encrypted text, and the text image includes decrypted text. The present invention carefully intervenes with the formatting of the text image so that it is formatted according to the decrypted text, and not according to the encrypted text within the source file. Effectively, as described at paragraph [0075] of the original specification, the present invention "fools" the formatting "*into believing that the encrypted text does indeed have the same character and word sizes as the original text, when in fact it does not.*"

In distinction to Bloomberg, the present invention reproduces text, and not rectangular blocks. Thus, as explained hereinabove, whereas the iconic

image of Bloomberg comprises a plurality of encoded rectangular blocks that resemble a text image, the present invention displays a text image.

The rejections of claims 1 – 12, 14 - 18, 22 – 37, 39 - 43, 47 – 58, 60 - 63, 67 – 79, 81 – 84, 88 – 92, 115 – 132, 141 and 142 on pages 4 - 24 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent method claim 1 and new independent claim 171 for a computer-readable medium, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 1 and claim 171 of

"*controlling a display layout for the modified page, comprising determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of original text*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On pages 15 and 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner has cited FIGS. 4 and 5 of Bloomberg in regards to "*decrypting encrypted content, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content.*" Applicant respectfully submits that the encrypted content in Bloomberg comprises rectangular blocks, as indicated in FIG. 4 of Bloomberg, and not encrypted text as indicated in FIG. 1A of the present specification. In distinction, the encrypted content in amended claim 1 and new claim 171 comprises text. Moreover, the technique for determining display layout of text, as described in the present invention at paragraphs [0066] – [0082], is based inter alia on types and sizes of fonts, white spaces, word widths and punctuation, and is different and more complex than the technique for determining display layout of rectangular blocks. Applicant has accordingly amended the language of claim 1 from "content" to "text," in order to further distinguish over Bloomberg.

Because claims 2 – 12, 14 - 18 and 22 - 25 depend from claim 1 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 – 12, 14 - 18 and 22 - 25 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 1 – 12, 14 – 18, 22 – 25 and 171 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 26, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 26 of

"*a page formatter controlling a display layout for the modified page, by determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of original text*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On pages 15 and 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner has cited FIGS. 4 and 5 of Bloomberg in regards to "*decrypting encrypted content, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content.*" Applicant respectfully submits that the encrypted content in Bloomberg comprises rectangular blocks, as indicated in FIG. 4 of Bloomberg, and not encrypted text as indicated in FIG. 1A of the present specification. In distinction, the encrypted content in amended claim 26 comprises text. Moreover, the technique for determining display layout of text, as described in the present invention at paragraphs [0066] – [0082], is based inter alia on types and sizes of fonts, white spaces, word widths and punctuation, and is different and more complex than the technique for determining display layout of rectangular blocks. Applicant has accordingly amended the language of claim 26 from "content" to "text," in order to further distinguish over Bloomberg.

Because claims 27 – 37, 39 - 43 and 47 - 50 depend from claim 26 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 27 – 37, 39 - 43 and 47 - 50 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 26 – 37, 39 - 43 and 47 - 50 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent method claim 51 and new independent claim 172 for a computer-readable medium, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 51 and claim 172 of

"*determining a display layout for the page, but based on spatial characteristics of decrypted content instead of spatial characteristics of encrypted*

content, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing decrypted content"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On pages 15 and 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner has cited FIGS. 4 and 5 of Bloomberg in regards to "*decrypting encrypted content, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content.*" Applicant respectfully submits that the encrypted content in Bloomberg comprises rectangular blocks, as indicated in FIG. 4 of Bloomberg, and not encrypted text as indicated in FIG. 1A of the present specification. In distinction, the encrypted content in amended claim 51 and new claim 172 comprises text. Moreover, the technique for determining display layout of text, as described in the present invention at paragraphs [0066] – [0082], is based inter alia on types and sizes of fonts, white spaces, word widths and punctuation, and is different and more complex than the technique for determining display layout of rectangular blocks. Applicant has accordingly amended the language of claim 51 from "content" to "text," in order to further distinguish over Bloomberg.

Because claims 52 – 58, 60 - 63 and 67 - 71 depend from claim 51 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 52 – 58, 60 - 63 and 67 - 71 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 51 – 58, 60 – 63, 67 – 71 and 172 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 72, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 72 of

"*a page formatter controlling a display layout for the page, by determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing decrypted text*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On pages 15 and 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner has cited FIGS. 4 and 5 of Bloomberg in regards to "*decrypting encrypted content, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing*

the designated portion of original content." Applicant respectfully submits that the encrypted content in Bloomberg comprises rectangular blocks, as indicated in FIG. 4 of Bloomberg, and not encrypted text as indicated in FIG. 1A of the present specification. In distinction, the encrypted content in amended claim 72 comprises text. Moreover, the technique for determining display layout of text, as described in the present invention at paragraphs [0066] – [0082], is based inter alia on types and sizes of fonts, white spaces, word widths and punctuation, and is different and more complex than the technique for determining display layout of rectangular blocks. Applicant has accordingly amended the language of claim 72 from "content" to "text," in order to further distinguish over Bloomberg.

Because claims 73 – 79, 81 - 84 and 88 - 92 depend from claim 72 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 73 – 79, 81 - 84 and 88 - 92 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 72 – 79, 81 - 84 and 88 - 92 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent method claim 115 and new independent claim 173 for a computer-readable medium, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 115 and claim 173 of

"*formatting a page containing a first portion of text to determine a page layout for display, but based on spatial characteristics of a second portion of text instead of spatial characteristics of a first portion of text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the second portion of text*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On page 10 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 115, the Examiner has cited col. 10, lines 42 – 48 of Bloomberg in regards to "*rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics devices comprising replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text.*" Applicant respectfully submits that Bloomberg does not replace text with text; rather, Bloomberg replaces text with rectangular blocks.

Because claims 116 – 123 depend from claim 115 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 116 – 123 are not

anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 115 – 123 and 173 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 124, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 124 of

"*a page formatter formatting a page containing a first portion of text to determine a page layout for display, but based on spatial characteristics of a second portion of text instead of spatial characteristics of a first portion of text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the second portion of text*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On page 10 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 124, the Examiner has cited col. 10, lines 42 – 48 of Bloomberg in regards to "*rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics devices comprising replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text.*" Applicant respectfully submits that Bloomberg does not replace text with text; rather, Bloomberg replaces text with rectangular blocks.

Because claims 125 - 132 depend from claim 124 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 125 - 132 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 124 - 132 are deemed to be allowable.

As to independent method claim 141 and new independent claim 174 for a computer-readable medium, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 141 and claim 174 of

"*replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On page 11 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 141, the Examiner has cited col. 12, lines 5 – 18 of Bloomberg in regards to

"*replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout.*" Applicant respectfully submits that Bloomberg does not replace text strings with text strings; rather, Bloomberg replaces text strings with rectangular blocks.

Accordingly claims 141 and 174 are deemed to be allowable.

As to independent system claim 142, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 142 of

"*a string processor replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout*"

is neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination. On page 11 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 142, the Examiner has cited col. 12, lines 5 – 18 of Bloomberg in regards to "*replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout.*" Applicant respectfully submits that Bloomberg does not replace text strings with text strings; rather, Bloomberg replaces text strings with rectangular blocks.

Accordingly claim 142 is deemed to be allowable.

As to new independent method claim 143 and new independent claim 175 for a computer-readable medium, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 143 and claim 175 of

"*an electronic capture of the screen produces an image containing a second portion of text instead of the first portion of text, the second portion of text being different than the first portion of text*"; and

"*the source file from which the page is rendered contains a third portion of text in place of the first portion of text, the third portion of text being different than the first portion of text*"

are neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims 144 - 156 depend from claim 143 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 144 - 156 are not

anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 143 - 156 and 175 are deemed to be allowable.

As to new independent system claim 154, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 154 of

"*an electronic capture of the screen produces an image containing a second portion of text instead of the first portion of text, the second portion of text being different than the first portion of text*"; and

"*the source file from which the page is rendered contains a third portion of text in place of the first portion of text, the third portion of text being different than the first portion of text*"

are neither shown nor suggested in Howard or Bloomberg, taken individually or in combination.

Because claims 155 - 170 depend from claim 154 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 155 - 170 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard, Bloomberg, or a combination of Howard and Bloomberg.

Accordingly claims 154 - 170 are deemed to be allowable.

Support for New and Amended Claims in Original Specification

New independent claims 143, 154 and 175 include the features that: (ii) an electronic capture of the screen produces an image containing a second portion of text instead of the first portion of text, the second portion of text being different than the first portion of text; and (iii) the source file from which the page is rendered contains a third portion of text in place of the first portion of text, the third portion of text being different than the first portion of text. Feature (ii) is described in the original specification at paragraph at paragraph [0044] with respect to FIGS. 1A and 1B. Specifically, the screen-capture shown in FIG. 1A contains encrypted text, which is different than the decrypted text shown in FIG. 1B, which is displayed on the screen. Feature (ii) is also described in the parent application, U.S. Serial No. 09/397,331 filed on September 14, 1999, now U.S. Patent No. 6,298,446, which teaches a general method and system for modification of data so that an electronic

capture of a screen generates data different than the data being displayed on the screen. Feature (iii) is described in the original specification at paragraph [0046] with respect to FIGS. 1C and 1B. Specifically, the source file shown in FIG. 1C contains encrypted text, which is different than the decrypted text shown in FIG. 1B, which is displayed on the screen.

Independent claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115 and 124 have been amended to include the feature of determining a display layout for a page containing a first portion of text, but based on spatial characteristics of a second portion of text instead of spatial characteristics of the first portion. This feature is described in the original specification at paragraphs [0075] – [0081], regarding "*'fooling' formatter 240 into believing that the encrypted text does indeed have the same character and word sizes as the original text, when in fact it does not.*"

New independent claims 171, 172, 173 and 174 correspond respectively to claims 1, 51, 115 and 141.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, he is invited to contact the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/3/05

By _____

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on
Date: Feb. 3, 2005 By: Cathi L.G. Thoorsell
Cathi L.G. Thoorsell

PaloAlto/78607.1